

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

HEATHER MARIE MEISER,

Plaintiff,

v.

ANDREW SAUL<sup>1</sup>,  
*Commissioner of Social Security*,

Defendant.

No. 4:18-CV-01058

(Judge Brann)

(Magistrate Judge Mehalchick)

**ORDER**

**SEPTEMBER 12, 2019**

Heather Marie Meiser filed this action seeking review of a decision by the Commissioner of Social Security (“Commissioner”) denying Meiser’s claim for social security disability benefits.<sup>2</sup> On August 5, 2019, Magistrate Judge Karoline Mehalchick issued a Report and Recommendation recommending that this Court affirm the Commissioner’s decision and close this case.<sup>3</sup> No timely objections were filed to this Report and Recommendation.

---

<sup>1</sup> Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 25(d), Andrew Saul, as the successor officer to Nancy Berryhill, Acting Commissioner of Social Security, is automatically substituted as Defendant in this action.

<sup>2</sup> Doc. 1.

<sup>3</sup> Doc. 19.

Where no objection is made to a report and recommendation, this Court will review the recommendation only for clear error.<sup>4</sup> Regardless of whether timely objections are made, district courts may accept, reject, or modify—in whole or in part—the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge.<sup>5</sup> Upon review of the record, the Court finds no clear error in Magistrate Judge Mehalchick’s conclusion that the Commissioner’s decision is supported by substantial evidence. Consequently, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that:

1. Magistrate Judge Karoline Mehalchick’s Report and Recommendation (Doc. 19) is **ADOPTED**.
2. The Commissioner’s decision is **AFFIRMED**.
3. Final Judgment is entered in favor of Defendant and against Plaintiff pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 58 and sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g).
4. The Clerk of Court is direct to **CLOSE** this case.

BY THE COURT:

*s/ Matthew W. Brann*

Matthew W. Brann  
United States District Judge

---

<sup>4</sup> Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b), advisory committee notes; *see Henderson v. Carlson*, 812 F.2d 874, 878 (3d Cir. 1987) (explaining that court should in some manner review recommendations regardless of whether objections were filed).

<sup>5</sup> 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Local Rule 72.31.